

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/768,406	RIVERS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kimberly T. Wood	3632	

All Participants:

(1) Kimberly T. Wood.

(2) Bambi Walters.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 4 August 2006

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No
 If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

112 first paragraph new matter or enablement; new species, and new invention

Claims discussed:

claims 17-29

Prior art documents discussed:


See Continuation Sheet

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

 (Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Identification of prior art discussed: claims 17 and its dependents will be rejected under 112 first paragraph since the elected species does not disclose within the specification how the first dnse secnd pivoting joints allow the tool support base plate to pivot about a horizontal axis relative to the top portion of the tool support base plate. The applicant needs to show in detail what elements make up the pivot and how the pivot works. Claims 26 and 27 will be withdrawn as being drawn to a non-elected species. Claim 29 will be withdrawn as drawn to a different invention.